arXiv:1606.07592v2 [math.RA] 25 Aug 2016

EPSILON-STRONGLY GRADED RINGS, SEPARABILITY AND SEMISIMPLICITY

PATRIK NYSTEDT

University West, Department of Engineering Science, SE-46186 Trollhättan, Sweden

JOHAN ÖINERT

Blekinge Institute of Technology, Department of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, SE-37179 Karlskrona, Sweden

HÉCTOR PINEDO

Universidad Industrial de Santander, Escuela de Matemáticas, Carrera 27 Calle 9, Edificio Camilo Torres Apartado de correos 678, Bucaramanga, Colombia

Abstract. We introduce the class of epsilon-strongly graded rings and show that it properly contains both the collection of strongly graded rings and the family of unital partial crossed products. We determine when epsilon-strongly graded rings are separable over their principal components. Thereby, we simultaneously generalize a result for strongly group graded rings by Năstăsescu, Van den Bergh and Van Oystaeyen, and a result for unital partial crossed products by Bagio, Lazzarin and Paques. We also show that the family of unital partial crossed products appear in the class of epsilon-strongly graded rings in a fashion similar to how the classical crossed products present themselves in the family of strongly graded rings. Thereby, we obtain, in the special case of unital partial crossed products, a short proof of a general result by Dokuchaev, Exel and Simón concerning when graded rings can be presented as partial crossed products.

E-mail addresses: patrik.nystedt@hv.se; johan.oinert@bth.se; hpinedot@uis.edu.co.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16W50, 16S35, 16H05, 16K99, 16E60.

Key words and phrases. group graded ring, partial crossed product, separable, semisimple, Frobenius.

1. Introduction

Let S be an associative ring equipped with a non-zero multiplicative identity 1. Let S/R be a ring extension. By this we mean that R is a subring of S containing 1. Recall that S/R is called *separable* if the multiplication map $m : S \otimes_R S \to S$ is a splitting epimorphism of R-bimodules. Equivalently, this can be formulated by saying that there is $x \in S \otimes_R S$ satisfying $m(x) = 1$ and that, for every $s \in S$, the relation $sx = xs$ holds. In that case, x is called a *separability element* of $S \otimes_R S$. Separable ring extensions are a natural generalization of the classical separability condition for algebras over fields which in turn is a generalization of separable field extensions (see e.g. [7]). Năstăsescu, Van den Bergh and Van Oystaeyen [20] have generalized this even further by introducing the notion of a *separable functor*. They show that a ring extension is separable precisely when the associated restriction functor is separable. A lot of work has been devoted to the question of when ring extensions are separable (see e.g. [1], [2], [3], [4], [7], [9], [10], [14], [15], [18], [20], [22] and [24]). One reason for this intense interest is that properties of the ground ring R automatically are inherited by S, such as semisimplicity and hereditarity (see e.g. [20]).

In the context of group graded rings, necessary and sufficient criteria for separability has been obtained in two different cases (see Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 below). Indeed, let G be a group with identity element e. Let S be *graded* by G. Recall that this means that, for each $g \in G$, there is an additive subgroup S_g of S such that $S = \oplus_{g\in G} S_g$ and $S_g S_h \subseteq S_{gh}$. The subring $R = S_e$ is called the *principal component* of S.

In the first case, S is *strongly graded*. Recall that this means that $S_g S_h = S_{gh}$ for $g, h \in G$. This makes each S_g, for $g \in G$, an invertible R-bimodule which implies that there is a unique ring automorphism $\beta_g : Z(R) \to Z(R)$ such that $\beta_g(r)s = sr$, for $r \in Z(R)$ and $s \in S_g$ (see [18] and Definition 9). If G is finite, then the trace function $\mathrm{tr}_\beta : Z(R) \to Z(R)$ is defined by $\mathrm{tr}_\beta(r) = \sum_{g\in G} \beta_g(r)$, for $r \in Z(R)$.

Theorem 1 (Năstăsescu, Van den Bergh and Van Oystaeyen [20])**.** *If S is strongly graded by G, then S/R is separable if and only if G is finite and $1 \in \mathrm{tr}_\beta(Z(R))$.*

In the second case, S is a *unital partial crossed product* of G over R. Recall that a *unital twisted partial action* of G on R is a triple

$$\alpha = (\{D_g\}_{g\in G}, \{\alpha_g\}_{g\in G}, \{w_{g,h}\}_{(g,h)\in G\times G})$$

where for each $g \in G$, D_g is a unital ideal of R having an (not necessarily non-zero) identity element 1_g which is central in R, $\alpha_g : D_{g^{-1}} \to D_g$ is an isomorphism of rings, and for each $(g, h) \in G \times G$, $w_{g,h}$ is an invertible element from $D_g D_{gh}$, satisfying the following assertions for all $g, h, l \in G$:

(P1) $\alpha_e = \mathrm{id}_R$;
(P2) $\alpha_g(D_{g^{-1}} D_h) = D_g D_{gh}$;

(P3) if $r \in D_{h^{-1}} D_{(gh)^{-1}}$, then $\alpha_g(\alpha_h(r)) = w_{g,h}\alpha_{gh}(r)w_{g,h}^{-1}$;
(P4) $w_{e,g} = w_{g,e} = 1_g$;
(P5) if $r \in D_{g^{-1}} D_h D_{hl}$, then $\alpha_g(rw_{h,l})w_{g,hl} = \alpha_g(r)w_{g,h}w_{gh,l}$.

Given a unital twisted partial action of G on R, the unital partial crossed product $R \star_\alpha^w G$ is the direct sum $\oplus_{g\in G} D_g\delta_g$, in which the δ_g's are formal symbols, and the multiplication is defined by the biadditive extension of the relations

(P6) $(r\delta_g)(r'\delta_h) = r\alpha_g(r'1_{g^{-1}})w_{g,h}\delta_{gh}$,

for $g, h \in G$, $r \in D_g$ and $r' \in D_h$. If G is finite, then the trace function $\mathrm{tr}_\alpha : Z(R) \to Z(R)$ is defined by $\mathrm{tr}_\alpha(r) = \sum_{g\in G} \alpha_g(r1_{g^{-1}})$, for $r \in Z(R)$.

Theorem 2 (Bagio, Lazzarin and Paques [1])**.** *If S is a unital partial crossed product of a finite group G over R, then S/R is separable if and only if $1 \in \mathrm{tr}_\alpha(Z(R))$.*

In this article, we wish to unify Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 (see Theorem 3) for a class of rings which properly contains both the family of strongly graded rings and the class of partial crossed products. We call this class of rings *epsilon-strongly graded*. The term "epsilon-strongly" is supposed to be suggestive of the fact that the grading is "an epsilon away" from being strong. Here is an outline of the article.

In Section 2, we introduce epsilon-strongly graded rings (see Definition 4). The idea behind the definition is the following. Suppose that S is a ring graded by a group G and take $g \in G$. Then $S_gS_{g^{-1}}$ is an ideal of R. Instead of postulating that this ideal equals R, as in the strongly graded case, we relax this condition by assuming that this ideal is unital with a (not necessarily non-zero) multiplicative identity ϵ_g in $Z(R)$, such that for every $s \in S_g$, the relations $\epsilon_g s = s = s\epsilon_{g^{-1}}$ hold. It turns out that in this context there is also a trace function $\mathrm{tr}_\gamma : Z(R)_{\mathrm{fin}} \to Z(R)$ (see Definition 9). Here $Z(R)_{\mathrm{fin}}$ is the set of $r \in Z(R)$ with the property that for all but finitely many $g \in G$, the relation $r\epsilon_g = 0$ holds. At the end of Section 2, we show the following simultaneous generalization of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2. Notice that our result holds for any, possibly infinite, group G.

Theorem 3. *If S is epsilon-strongly graded by G, then S/R is separable if and only if $1 \in \mathrm{tr}_\gamma(Z(R)_{\mathrm{fin}})$.*

In Section 3, we use Theorem 3 to find criteria for when epsilon-strongly graded rings are semisimple, hereditary or Frobenius (see Theorem 18 and Theorem 19).

In Section 4, we show that a result concerning simplicity for strongly graded rings from [16, Theorem 6.6] can be generalized to epsilon-strongly graded rings (see Proposition 23).

In Section 5, we introduce epsilon-crossed products (see Definition 26). We show that the class of epsilon-crossed products coincides with the class of unital partial crossed products (see Theorem 27). This is an epsilon-analogue

of how the classical crossed products appear in the class of strongly graded rings (see e.g. [19]). Thereby, we obtain, in the special case of unital partial crossed products, a short proof of a general result by Dokuchaev, Exel and Simón [8] concerning when graded rings can be presented as partial crossed products. At the end of the section, we use Theorem 3 to reformulate Theorem 2 so that it holds for any, possibly infinite, group G (see Theorem 29).

In Section 6, we give a class of examples of separable epsilon-strongly graded rings, neither of which are strongly graded, nor partial crossed products, in any natural way (see Proposition 32 and Proposition 33).

In Section 7, we consider Morita rings which are in a natural way $\mathbb{Z}$-graded. Under weak assumptions they are in fact epsilon-strongly graded and separable over their principal components (see Proposition 35).

2. Separability

Throughout this section, G denotes a group and S denotes a ring which is graded by G. Put $R = S_e$ and let $\mathbb{N}$ denote the positive integers. In this section, we first introduce epsilon-strongly graded rings (see Definition 4). Then we will, for each $g \in G$, introduce an additive function $\gamma_g : S \to S$ (see Definition 5). These functions will in turn be used to define a trace function $\mathrm{tr}_\gamma : Z(R)_{\mathrm{fin}} \to Z(R)$ (see Definition 9). At the end of this section, we prove Theorem 3.

Definition 4. We say that S is *epsilon-strongly graded* if for every $g \in G$, the set $S_g S_{g^{-1}}$ is a unital ideal of R, with a (not necessarily non-zero) multiplicative identity ϵ_g in $Z(R)$, such that for every $s \in S_g$, the relations $\epsilon_g s = s = s\epsilon_{g^{-1}}$ hold.

For the rest of this section, we assume that S is epsilon-strongly graded by G.

Definition 5. Take $g \in G$. From the relation $\epsilon_g \in S_g S_{g^{-1}}$ it follows that there is $n_g \in \mathbb{N}$, and $u_g^{(i)} \in S_g$ and $v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)} \in S_{g^{-1}}$, for $i \in \{1, \dots, n_g\}$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n_g} u_g^{(i)} v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)} = \epsilon_g$. Unless otherwise stated, the elements $u_g^{(i)}$ and $v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)}$ are fixed. We also assume that $n_e = 1$ and $u_e^{(1)} = v_e^{(1)} = 1$. Define the additive function $\gamma_g : S \to S$ by $\gamma_g(s) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_g} u_g^{(i)} s v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)}$, for $s \in S$.

Proposition 6. *Take $g \in G$ and $r \in Z(R)$. Then the definition of $\gamma_g(r)$ does not depend on the choice of the elements $u_g^{(i)}$ and $v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)}$.*

Proof. Take $m_g \in \mathbb{N}$, $s_g^{(j)} \in S_g$ and $t_{g^{-1}}^{(j)} \in S_{g^{-1}}$, for $j \in \{1, \dots, m_g\}$, such that $\sum_{j=1}^{m_g} s_g^{(j)} t_{g^{-1}}^{(j)} = \epsilon_g$. Then

$$\gamma_g(r) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_g} u_g^{(i)} r v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_g} \epsilon_g u_g^{(i)} r v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_g} \sum_{j=1}^{m_g} s_g^{(j)} t_{g^{-1}}^{(j)} u_g^{(i)} r v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)}.$$

Since $t^{(j)}_{g^{-1}}u^{(i)}_g \in R$ and $r \in Z(R)$, the last sum equals

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_g}\sum_{j=1}^{m_g} s^{(j)}_g r t^{(j)}_{g^{-1}} u^{(i)}_g v^{(i)}_{g^{-1}} = \sum_{j=1}^{m_g} s^{(j)}_g r t^{(j)}_{g^{-1}} \epsilon_g = \sum_{j=1}^{m_g} s^{(j)}_g r t^{(j)}_{g^{-1}}.$$

□

Proposition 7. *Take $g, h \in G$ and $r \in Z(R)$. Then $\gamma_g(\gamma_h(r)) = \gamma_{gh}(r)\epsilon_g$.*

Proof. From the definitions of γ_g and γ_h, it follows that

$$\gamma_g(\gamma_h(r)) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_h} \gamma_g(u^{(i)}_h r v^{(i)}_{h^{-1}}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_h}\sum_{j=1}^{n_g} u^{(j)}_g u^{(i)}_h r v^{(i)}_{h^{-1}} v^{(j)}_{g^{-1}}.$$

Since $u^{(j)}_g u^{(i)}_h \in S_{gh}$, the last sum equals

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_h}\sum_{j=1}^{n_g} \epsilon_{gh} u^{(j)}_g u^{(i)}_h r v^{(i)}_{h^{-1}} v^{(j)}_{g^{-1}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_h}\sum_{j=1}^{n_g}\sum_{k=1}^{n_{gh}} u^{(k)}_{gh} v^{(k)}_{h^{-1}g^{-1}} u^{(j)}_g u^{(i)}_h r v^{(i)}_{h^{-1}} v^{(j)}_{g^{-1}}.$$

Since $r \in Z(R)$ and $v^{(k)}_{h^{-1}g^{-1}} u^{(j)}_g u^{(i)}_h \in R$, the last sum equals

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_h}\sum_{j=1}^{n_g}\sum_{k=1}^{n_{gh}} u^{(k)}_{gh} r v^{(k)}_{h^{-1}g^{-1}} u^{(j)}_g u^{(i)}_h v^{(i)}_{h^{-1}} v^{(j)}_{g^{-1}} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_g}\sum_{k=1}^{n_{gh}} u^{(k)}_{gh} r v^{(k)}_{h^{-1}g^{-1}} u^{(j)}_g \epsilon_h v^{(j)}_{g^{-1}}.$$

Since $v^{(k)}_{h^{-1}g^{-1}} u^{(j)}_g \in S_{h^{-1}}$, the last sum equals

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n_g}\sum_{k=1}^{n_{gh}} u^{(k)}_{gh} r v^{(k)}_{h^{-1}g^{-1}} u^{(j)}_g v^{(j)}_{g^{-1}} = \sum_{k=1}^{n_{gh}} u^{(k)}_{gh} r v^{(k)}_{h^{-1}g^{-1}} \epsilon_g = \gamma_{gh}(r)\epsilon_g.$$

□

Proposition 8. *Take $g \in G$. The additive function $\gamma_g : S \to S$ restricts to a surjective ring homomorphism $Z(R) \to Z(R)\epsilon_g$. This function, in turn, restricts to a ring isomorphism $Z(R)\epsilon_{g^{-1}} \to Z(R)\epsilon_g$.*

Proof. First we show that $\gamma_g(Z(R)) \subseteq Z(R)\epsilon_g$. From the definition of γ_g it follows that $\gamma_g(S) \subseteq S\epsilon_g$. Thus, since ϵ_g is idempotent, we only need to show that $\gamma_g(Z(R)) \subseteq Z(R)$. To this end, take $r \in Z(R)$ and $r' \in R$. Then, since $v^{(i)}_{g^{-1}} r' \in S_{g^{-1}}$, we get that

$$\gamma_g(r)r' = \sum_{i=1}^{n_g} u^{(i)}_g r v^{(i)}_{g^{-1}} r' = \sum_{i=1}^{n_g} u^{(i)}_g r v^{(i)}_{g^{-1}} r' \epsilon_g = \sum_{i=1}^{n_g}\sum_{j=1}^{n_g} u^{(i)}_g r v^{(i)}_{g^{-1}} r' u^{(j)}_g v^{(j)}_{g^{-1}}.$$

Since $r \in Z(R)$, $v^{(i)}_{g^{-1}} r' u^{(j)}_g \in R$ and $r' u^{(j)}_g \in S_g$, the last sum equals

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_g}\sum_{j=1}^{n_g} u^{(i)}_g v^{(i)}_{g^{-1}} r' u^{(j)}_g r v^{(j)}_{g^{-1}} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_g} \epsilon_g r' u^{(j)}_g r v^{(j)}_{g^{-1}} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_g} r' u^{(j)}_g r v^{(j)}_{g^{-1}} = r'\gamma_g(r).$$

This shows that $\gamma_g(r) \in Z(R)$. Now we show that the restriction of γ_g to $Z(R)$ respects multiplication. Take $r, r' \in Z(R)$. Then

$$\gamma_g(rr') = \sum_{i=1}^{n_g} u_g^{(i)} rr' v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_g} \epsilon_g u_g^{(i)} rr' v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_g}\sum_{j=1}^{n_g} u_g^{(j)} v_{g^{-1}}^{(j)} u_g^{(i)} rr' v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)}.$$

Since $r \in Z(R)$ and $v_{g^{-1}}^{(j)} u_g^{(i)} \in R$, the last sum equals

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_g}\sum_{j=1}^{n_g} u_g^{(j)} r v_{g^{-1}}^{(j)} u_g^{(i)} r' v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_g} u_g^{(j)} r v_{g^{-1}}^{(j)} \sum_{i=1}^{n_g} u_g^{(i)} r' v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)} = \gamma_g(r)\gamma_g(r').$$

Next, we show that the restriction $Z(R) \to Z(R)\epsilon_g$ is surjective. Take $r \in Z(R)$. From Proposition 7, we get that $\gamma_g(\gamma_{g^{-1}}(r\epsilon_g)) = \gamma_e(r\epsilon_g)\epsilon_g = r\epsilon_g^2 = r\epsilon_g$. Finally, we need show that the restriction $Z(R)\epsilon_{g^{-1}} \to Z(R)\epsilon_g$ is injective. Suppose that $r \in Z(R)$ is chosen so that $\gamma_g(r\epsilon_{g^{-1}}) = 0$. From Proposition 7, we get that $r\epsilon_{g^{-1}} = r\epsilon_{g^{-1}}^2 = \gamma_e(r\epsilon_{g^{-1}})\epsilon_{g^{-1}} = \gamma_{g^{-1}}(\gamma_g(r\epsilon_{g^{-1}})) = 0$. □

Definition 9. Let $Z(R)_{\text{fin}}$ denote the set of $r \in Z(R)$ such that for all but finitely many $g \in G$, the relation $r\epsilon_g = 0$ holds. Define the *trace* function $\text{tr}_\gamma : Z(R)_{\text{fin}} \to Z(R)$ by $\text{tr}_\gamma(r) = \sum_{g\in G} \gamma_g(r)$, for $r \in R$.

Remark 10. Recall that if we for every $g \in G$ put

$$(S \otimes_R S)_g = \bigoplus_{\substack{(g',g'')\in G\times G,\\ g'g''=g}} S_{g'} \otimes_R S_{g''},$$

then this defines a graded R-bimodule structure on $S \otimes_R S$. We will refer to this as the G-grading of $S \otimes_R S$. There is another type of grading on $S \otimes_R S$ that we will also use. If we, for every $(g, h) \in G \times G$, put

$$(S \otimes_R S)_{(g,h)} = S_g \otimes_R S_h,$$

then this defines a graded additive structure on $S \otimes_R S$. We will refer to this as the $(G \times G)$-grading on $S \otimes_R S$. For more details concerning these gradings, see [19].

Proof of Theorem 3. First we show the "if" statement. Suppose that there is $c \in Z(R)_{\text{fin}}$ such that $\text{tr}_\gamma(c) = 1$. We wish to show that S/R is separable. To this end, put $x = \sum_{g\in G}\sum_{i=1}^{n_g} u_g^{(i)} c \otimes v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)}$. From the definition of $Z(R)_{\text{fin}}$ it follows that x is well-defined, since for all but finitely many $g \in G$, we get that $u_g^{(i)} c = u_g^{(i)} \epsilon_{g^{-1}} c = u_g^{(i)} 0 = 0$. Now

$$m(x) = \sum_{g\in G}\sum_{i=1}^{n_g} u_g^{(i)} c v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)} = \sum_{g\in G} \gamma_g(c) = \text{tr}_\gamma(c) = 1.$$

Next we show that x commutes with all elements of S. To this end, take $h \in G$ and $s \in S_h$. Since $su_g^{(i)} \in S_{hg}$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} sx &= \sum_{g\in G}\sum_{i=1}^{n_g} su_g^{(i)} c \otimes v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)} = \sum_{g\in G}\sum_{i=1}^{n_g} \epsilon_{hg} su_g^{(i)} c \otimes v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)} \\ &= \sum_{g\in G}\sum_{i=1}^{n_g}\sum_{j=1}^{n_{hg}} u_{hg}^{(j)} v_{g^{-1}h^{-1}}^{(j)} su_g^{(i)} c \otimes v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $c \in Z(R)$ and $v_{g^{-1}h^{-1}}^{(j)} su_g^{(i)} \in R$, the last sum equals

$$\sum_{g\in G}\sum_{i=1}^{n_g}\sum_{j=1}^{n_{hg}} u_{hg}^{(j)} c \otimes v_{g^{-1}h^{-1}}^{(j)} su_g^{(i)} v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)} = \sum_{g\in G}\sum_{j=1}^{n_{hg}} u_{hg}^{(j)} c \otimes v_{g^{-1}h^{-1}}^{(j)} s\epsilon_g.$$

Since $v_{g^{-1}h^{-1}}^{(j)} s \in S_{g^{-1}}$, the last sum equals $\sum_{g\in G}\sum_{j=1}^{n_{hg}} u_{hg}^{(j)} c \otimes v_{g^{-1}h^{-1}}^{(j)} s = xs$. Therefore, x is a separability element for S/R.

Now we show the "only if" statement. Suppose that $x \in S \otimes S$ is a separability element for S/R. Then x satisfies $m(x) = 1$ and, for each $s \in S$, the relation $xs = sx$ holds. From the G-grading on $S \otimes_R S$ it follows that there are unique $y \in (S \otimes_R S)_e$ and $z \in \oplus_{g\in G\setminus\{e\}}(S \otimes_R S)_g$ such that $x = y + z$. Then we get that $1 = m(x) = m(y) + m(z)$. But since $1 \in R$ and $m(z) \in \oplus_{g\in G\setminus\{e\}} S_g$, we get that $m(z) = 0$ and $m(y) = 1$. We claim that for each $s \in S$, the relation $ys = sy$ holds. To this end, take $h \in G$ and $s \in S_h$. Then $0 = sx - xs = sy - ys + sz - zs$. Since $sy - ys \in (S \otimes_R S)_h$ and $sz - zs \in \sum_{g\in G\setminus\{e\}} ((S \otimes_R S)_{hg} + (S \otimes_R S)_{gh})$, we get that $sy - ys = 0$ and $sz - zs = 0$. In particular, y is also a separability element for S/R. Now, for each $g \in G$, there is $d_g \in S_g \otimes_R S_{g^{-1}}$ such that for all but finitely many $g \in G$, $d_g = 0$, and $y = \sum_{g\in G} d_g$. Furthermore, for each $g \in G$, there is $l_g \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_g^{(i)} \in S_g$ and $b_{g^{-1}}^{(i)} \in S_{g^{-1}}$, for $i \in \{1, \ldots, l_g\}$, such that $d_g = \sum_{i=1}^{l_g} a_g^{(i)} \otimes b_{g^{-1}}^{(i)}$. For each $g \in G$, put $c_g = m(d_g)$. Take $h \in G$. From the $(G \times G)$-grading on $S \otimes_R S$ it follows that d_h commutes with every $r \in R$. Therefore, it follows that $c_h \in Z(R)$. Take $s \in S_h$. From the $(G \times G)$-grading on $S \otimes_R S$ it also follows that $sd_e = d_h s$. Applying m gives us that $sc_e = c_h s$. In particular, we get that

$$\gamma_h(c_e) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_h} u_h^{(i)} c_e v_{h^{-1}}^{(i)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_h} c_h u_h^{(i)} v_{h^{-1}}^{(i)} = c_h \epsilon_h = c_h.$$

Summing over $h \in G$ gives us that

$$\mathrm{tr}_\gamma(c_e) = \sum_{h\in G} \gamma_h(c_e) = \sum_{h\in G} c_h = \sum_{h\in G} m(d_h) = m(y) = 1.$$

Since, for all but finitely many $h \in G$, $d_h = 0$, the same is true for c_h and hence also for $\gamma_h(c_e)$. From Proposition 7, it thus follows that for all but

finitely many $h \in G$, the relation $c_e\epsilon_{h^{-1}} = \gamma_{h^{-1}}(\gamma_h(c_e)) = 0$ holds. Thus, $c_e \in Z(R)_{\text{fin}}$. □

Definition 11. Let $Z(R)^\gamma_{\text{fin}}$ denote the set of $r \in Z(R)_{\text{fin}}$ with the property that for every $g \in G$, the relation $\gamma_g(r) = r\epsilon_g$ holds.

Lemma 12. *With the above notation, the following assertions hold:*

(a) *The set $Z(R)_{\text{fin}}$ is a (possibly non-unital) subring of $Z(R)$. $1 \in Z(R)_{\text{fin}}$ if and only if for all but finitely many $g \in G$, $\epsilon_g = 0$.*
(b) *The set $Z(R)^\gamma_{\text{fin}}$ is a (possibly non-unital) subring of $Z(R)_{\text{fin}}$. $1 \in Z(R)^\gamma_{\text{fin}}$ if and only if for all but finitely many $g \in G$, $\epsilon_g = 0$.*
(c) *$\text{tr}_\gamma(Z(R)_{\text{fin}}) \subseteq Z(R)^\gamma_{\text{fin}}$ and the function $\text{tr}_\gamma : Z(R)_{\text{fin}} \to Z(R)^\gamma_{\text{fin}}$ is a $Z(R)^\gamma_{\text{fin}}$-bimodule homomorphism.*
(d) *Suppose that $\epsilon_g = 0$, for all but finitely many $g \in G$. If $r \in Z(R)^\gamma_{\text{fin}}$ and r is invertible in $Z(R)$, then $r^{-1} \in Z(R)^\gamma_{\text{fin}}$.*

Proof. (a) Take $r, r' \in Z(R)_{\text{fin}}$. Let $X(r)$ denote the finite set $\{g \in G \mid r\epsilon_g \neq 0\}$. Then $X(rr') \subseteq X(r')$ which is a finite set. Also $X(r+r') \subseteq X(r) \cup X(r')$ which is a finite set. Therefore $Z(R)_{\text{fin}}$ is a subring of $Z(R)$. Also $1 \in Z(R)_{\text{fin}}$ precisely when $\epsilon_g = 1\epsilon_g = 0$ for all but finitely many $g \in G$.

(b) Take $r, r' \in Z(R)^\gamma_{\text{fin}}$. From (a) we know that $rr', r + r' \in Z(R)_{\text{fin}}$. Take $g \in G$. From Proposition 8, it follows that $\gamma_g(rr') = \gamma_g(r)\gamma_g(r') = r\epsilon_g r'\epsilon_g = rr'\epsilon_g$. Also $\gamma_g(r + r') = \gamma_g(r) + \gamma_g(r') = r\epsilon_g + r'\epsilon_g = (r + r')\epsilon_g$. Therefore $rr', r + r' \in Z(R)^\gamma_{\text{fin}}$. Since $\gamma_g(1) = \epsilon_g$, the last part of (b) follows from (a).

(c) Take $r \in Z(R)_{\text{fin}}$ and $g \in G$. By Proposition 7, we get that $\gamma_g(\text{tr}_\gamma(r)) = \sum_{h\in G} \gamma_g(\gamma_h(r)) = \sum_{h\in G} \gamma_{gh}(r)\epsilon_g = \text{tr}_\gamma(r)\epsilon_g$. Therefore, $\text{tr}_\gamma(r) \in Z(R)^\gamma_{\text{fin}}$. To prove the last statement, take $r \in Z(R)_{\text{fin}}$ and $r', r'' \in Z(R)^\gamma_{\text{fin}}$. Then Proposition 8 implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\text{tr}_\gamma(r'rr'') &= \sum_{g\in G} \gamma_g(r'rr'') = \sum_{g\in G} \gamma_g(r')\gamma_g(r)\gamma_g(r'') = \sum_{g\in G} r'\epsilon_g\gamma_g(r)r''\epsilon_g \\ &= \sum_{g\in G} r'\epsilon_g\gamma_g(r)\epsilon_g r'' = \sum_{g\in G} r'\gamma_g(r)r'' = r'\text{tr}_\gamma(r)r''.\end{aligned}$$

(d) From the relation $rr^{-1} = 1$, we get that $\gamma_g(r)\gamma_g(r^{-1}) = \epsilon_g$. Since $r \in Z(R)^\gamma_{\text{fin}}$, we get that $r\epsilon_g\gamma_g(r^{-1}) = \epsilon_g$. Thus $r^{-1}r\gamma_g(r^{-1}) = r^{-1}\epsilon_g$. Hence $\gamma_g(r^{-1}) = r^{-1}\epsilon_g$. □

Corollary 13. *Suppose that $\epsilon_g = 0$, for all but finitely many $g \in G$. If $\text{tr}_\gamma(1)$ is invertible in R, then S/R is separable.*

Proof. From Lemma 12(d), we get that $\text{tr}_\gamma(1)^{-1} \in Z(R)^\gamma_{\text{fin}}$. Thus, from Lemma 12(c), it follows that $\text{tr}_\gamma(\text{tr}_\gamma(1)^{-1}1) = \text{tr}_\gamma(1)^{-1}\text{tr}_\gamma(1) = 1$. Hence, S/R is separable due to Theorem 3. □

Remark 14. The sufficient condition concerning invertibility of $\text{tr}_\gamma(1)$ in Corollary 13 is not necessary for separability (see Proposition 33).

3. Semisimplicity, Hereditarity and Frobenius Properties

In this section, we use Theorem 3 to find criteria for when epsilon-strongly graded rings are semisimple, hereditary and Frobenius (see Theorem 18 and Theorem 19). For the rest of this section, S/R denotes a ring extension. Let res denote the restriction functor S-mod $\to$ R-mod. The following two results are quite well-known, but, for the convenience of the reader, we have chosen to include the proofs.

Proposition 15. *Suppose that S/R is separable and M is a left (right) S-module. If* res(M) *is left (right) projective, then M is left (right) projective.*

Proof. We only show the "left" part of the proof. The "right" part is shown in an analogous way and is therefore omitted. Take $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s_j, t_j \in S$, for $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, such that $x = \sum_{j=1}^{n} s_j \otimes t_j$ is a separability element of $S \otimes_R S$. Since res(M) is projective, M has a dual R-basis $\{m_i\}_{i\in I}$ and $\{f_i\}_{i\in I}$. For each $i \in I$, define $F_i : M \to S$ by $F_i(m) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} s_j f_i(t_j m)$, for $m \in M$. We wish to show that $\{F_i\}_{i\in I}$ and $\{m_i\}_{i\in I}$ is a dual S-basis for M. First of all, clearly, each F_i is additive. Next, for each $m \in M$, $\sum_{i\in I} F_i(m)m_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} s_j \sum_{i\in I} f_i(t_j m)m_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} s_j t_j m = 1m = m$. Finally, take $i \in I$, $s \in S$ and $m \in M$. We need to show that $F_i(sm) = sF_i(m)$, or, in other words, that $\sum_{j=1}^{n} s_j f_i(t_j sm) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} ss_j f(t_j m)$. To see this, first notice that $xs = sx$ implies that $\sum_{j=1}^{n} s_j \otimes t_j s = \sum_{j=1}^{n} ss_j \otimes t_j$. From the left $S \otimes_R S$-module structure on $S \otimes_R M$ it follows that $\sum_{j=1}^{n} s_j \otimes t_j sm = \sum_{j=1}^{n} ss_j \otimes t_j m$. By applying the function $S \otimes_R M \ni a \otimes b \mapsto a \otimes f_i(b) \in S \otimes_R M$ to the last equality, we get that $\sum_{j=1}^{n} s_j \otimes f_i(t_j sm) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} ss_j \otimes f_i(t_j m)$. Finally, applying the function $S \otimes_R M \ni a \otimes b \mapsto ab \in M$ to the last equality, we get that $\sum_{j=1}^{n} s_j f_i(t_j sm) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} ss_j f_i(t_j m)$. □

Lemma 16. *S is projective as a left R-module, if and only if, the functor* res *preserves projectives.*

Proof. Suppose that M is a projective left S-module. We wish to show that M, considered as a left R-module, is projective. Take a projective S-basis $\{m_i, f_i\}_{i\in I}$ for M and a projective R-basis $\{s_j, g_j\}_{j\in J}$ for S. Then $\{s_j m_i, g_j \circ f_i\}_{(i,j)\in I\times J}$ is a projective basis of M as a left R-module. Indeed, for $m \in M$ we have that

$$\sum_{(i,j)\in I\times J} (g_j \circ f_i)(m)(s_j m_i) = \sum_i \left(\sum_j g_j(f_i(m))s_j \right) m_i = \sum_i f_i(m)m_i = m.$$

The converse is clear. □

Recall that R is called left (right) semisimple if all left (right) R-modules are semisimple. Notice that since R is left semisimple if and only if R is right semisimple, (see [13, Corollary (3.7)]) the left/right distinction is therefore unnecessary. Recall that R is called left (right) hereditary if all submodules of left (right) projective modules over R are again projective.

Corollary 17. *Let S/R be separable. If R is semisimple (left/right hereditary and S is projective as a left/right R-module), then S is semisimple (left/right hereditary).*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 15, Lemma 16 and the fact that a ring is semisimple (hereditary) if and only if every module (or submodule of a projective module) over the ring is projective (see [13, Theorem (2.8)]). □

It is easy to see that if S is a ring graded by a group G and we put $R = S_e$, then semisimplicity (left/right hereditarity) of R is always necessary for S to be semisimple (left/right hereditary). In fact, this is true even in the more general setting of rings graded by categories (see [15, Proposition 3]). Now we determine sufficient conditions for semisimplicity (left/right hereditarity).

Theorem 18. *Let S be epsilon-strongly graded by a group G and put $R = S_e$. Suppose that R is semisimple (hereditary). If $1 \in \mathrm{tr}_\gamma(Z(R)_{\mathrm{fin}})$ (and every S_g, for $g \in G$, is projective as a left/right R-module), then S is semisimple (left/right hereditary). In particular, if $\epsilon_g = 0$ for all but finitely many $g \in G$ and $\mathrm{tr}_\gamma(1)$ is invertible in R (and every S_g, for $g \in G$, is projective as a left/right R-module), then S is semisimple (left/right hereditary).*

Proof. This follows from Theorem 3, Corollary 13, Corollary 17 and the fact that a direct sum of projective modules is projective. □

Recall that S/R is called a *Frobenius extension* if there is a finite set J, $x_j, y_j \in S$, for $j \in J$, and an R-bimodule map $E : S \to R$ such that, for every $s \in S$, the equalities $s = \sum_{j\in J} x_j E(y_j s) = \sum_{j\in J}^{n} E(s x_j) y_j$ hold. In that case, (E, x_j, y_j) is called a *Frobenius system*.

Theorem 19. *If S is epsilon-strongly graded by a finite group G and we put $R = S_e$, then S/R is a Frobenius extension.*

Proof. Put $J = \{(g, i) \mid g \in G,\ 1 \le i \le n_g\}$, where n_g is given by Definition 5. Since G is finite, J is finite. For each $j = (g, i) \in J$, define $x_j = u_g^{(i)}$ and $y_j = v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)}$. Define $E : S \to R$ by $E(s) = s_e$, for $s \in S$. Then, clearly, E is an R-bimodule map. Take $s \in S$. Then

$$\sum_{j\in J} x_j E(y_j s) = \sum_{g\in G}\sum_{i=1}^{n_g} u_g^{(i)} E(v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)} s) = \sum_{g\in G}\sum_{i=1}^{n_g} u_g^{(i)} v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)} s_g = \sum_{g\in G} \epsilon_g s_g = s$$

and

$$\sum_{j\in J}^{n} E(s x_j) y_j = \sum_{g\in G}\sum_{i=1}^{n_g} E(s u_g^{(i)}) v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)} = \sum_{g\in G}\sum_{i=1}^{n_g} s_{g^{-1}} u_g^{(i)} v_{g^{-1}}^{(i)} = \sum_{g\in G} s_{g^{-1}} \epsilon_g = s.$$

□

Recall that if T is a subset of S, then $C_S(T)$ denotes the set of $s \in S$ such that for every $t \in T$, the relation $st = ts$ holds.

Proposition 20. *Suppose that S/R is a Frobenius extension with Frobenius system (E, x_j, y_j). Then S/R is separable if and only if there is $d \in C_S(R)$ such that $\sum_{j\in J} x_j dy_j = 1$.*

Proof. See [12, Corollary 2.17]. □

Remark 21. Suppose that S is epsilon-strongly graded by a finite group G and put $R = S_e$. Using Theorem 19 and Proposition 20, we can, in this case, prove Theorem 3 in a different way. Indeed, using the above results, we can conclude that S/R is separable if and only if there is $d \in C_S(R)$ such that $\sum_{g\in G} \gamma_g(d) = \sum_{g\in G} \sum_{i=1}^{n_g} u_g^{(i)} dv_{g^{-1}}^{(i)} = 1$. Since $1 \in R$ it follows from the grading that S/R is separable if and only if there is $c = d_e \in C_R(R) = Z(R)$ such that $\mathrm{tr}_\gamma(c) = 1$.

4. Simplicity

In this short section, we show that a result concerning simplicity for strongly graded rings from [16, Theorem 6.6] can be generalized to epsilon-strongly graded rings (see Proposition 23). Throughout this section, S denotes a ring which is epsilon-strongly graded by a group G and we put $R = S_e$. Recall that R is called a *maximal commutative subring* of S if $C_S(R) = R$.

Lemma 22. *If I is a non-zero ideal of S, then $I \cap C_S(Z(R)) \neq \{0\}$.*

Proof. We claim that S is right non-degenerate in the sense of [17, Definition 2]. If we assume that the claim holds, then the desired result follows from [17, Theorem 3]. Now we show the claim. Take $g \in G$ and any non-zero $s \in S_g$. Seeking a contradiction, suppose that $sS_{g^{-1}} = \{0\}$. Then $sS_{g^{-1}}S_g = \{0\}$. But since $\epsilon_{g^{-1}} \in S_{g^{-1}}S_g$ we get that $s = s\epsilon_{g^{-1}} = 0$, which is a contradiction. □

Recall that an ideal I of S is said to be *graded* if $I = \oplus_{g\in G}(I \cap S_g)$ holds. If $\{0\}$ and S are the only graded ideals of S, then S is said to be *graded simple*.

Proposition 23. *If R is a maximal commutative subring of S, then S is simple if and only if S is graded simple.*

Proof. The "only if" statement is clear. Now we show the "if" statement. Let I be a non-zero ideal of S. By the assumption we have $C_S(Z(R)) = C_S(R) = R$. Hence, by Lemma 22 the set $J = I \cap C_S(Z(R))$ is a non-zero ideal of R. The set SJS is a non-zero graded ideal of S and thus, by graded simplicity of S, we get $S = SJS = J$. This shows that S is a simple ring. □

5. Partial Crossed Products

In this section, we introduce epsilon-crossed products (see Definition 26). We show that the class of epsilon-crossed products coincides with the class of unital partial crossed products (see Theorem 27). Thereby, we obtain, in

the special case of unital partial crossed products, a short proof of a more general result by Dokuchaev, Exel and Simón [8, Theorem 6.1] concerning when graded rings can be presented as partial crossed products. At the end of this section, we use Theorem 3 to reformulate Theorem 2 so that it holds for any, possibly infinite, group G (see Theorem 29).

Definition 24. Suppose that S is epsilon-strongly graded by G. Take $g \in G$ and $s \in S_g$. Then s is called *epsilon-invertible* if there is $t \in S_{g^{-1}}$ such that $st = \epsilon_g$ and $ts = \epsilon_{g^{-1}}$. We will refer to t as the *epsilon-inverse* of s.

The usage of the term "the epsilon-inverse" is justified by the next result.

Proposition 25. *Epsilon-inverses are unique.*

Proof. Suppose that $g \in G$, $s \in S_g$ and $r, t \in S_{g^{-1}}$ satisfy the equalities $st = sr = \epsilon_g$ and $ts = rs = \epsilon_{g^{-1}}$. Then $r = r\epsilon_g = rst = \epsilon_{g^{-1}}t = t$. □

Definition 26. Suppose that S is epsilon-strongly graded by G. We say that S is an *epsilon-crossed product by* G if for each $g \in G$, there is an epsilon-invertible element in S_g.

Theorem 27. *Suppose that S is epsilon-strongly graded by G. Then S is an epsilon-crossed product if and only if S is a unital partial crossed product.*

Proof. First we show the "only if" statement. Suppose that S is an epsilon-crossed product. We will present S as a unital partial crossed product. Take $g, h \in G$. Fix an epsilon-invertible element $s_g \in S_g$ with epsilon-inverse $t_{g^{-1}} \in S_{g^{-1}}$. We may assume that $s_e = t_e = 1$. Put $D_g = S_g S_{g^{-1}} = R\epsilon_g$, $1_g = \epsilon_g$ and $\delta_g = s_g$. Furthermore, define $\alpha_g : D_{g^{-1}} \to D_g$ by $\alpha_g(r\epsilon_{g^{-1}}) = s_g r t_{g^{-1}}$, for $r \in R$. Then α_g is well-defined. In fact, if $r, r' \in R$ satisfy $r\epsilon_{g^{-1}} = r'\epsilon_{g^{-1}}$, then $\alpha_g(r\epsilon_{g^{-1}}) = s_g r t_{g^{-1}} = s_g r \epsilon_{g^{-1}} t_{g^{-1}} = s_g r' \epsilon_{g^{-1}} t_{g^{-1}} = s_g r' t_{g^{-1}} = \alpha_g(r'\epsilon_{g^{-1}})$. The function α_g is bijective with inverse given by $\alpha_g^{-1}(r\epsilon_g) = t_{g^{-1}} r s_g$. Indeed, take $r \in R$. Then

$$\alpha_g^{-1}(\alpha_g(r\epsilon_{g^{-1}})) = t_{g^{-1}} s_g r t_{g^{-1}} s_g = \epsilon_{g^{-1}} r \epsilon_{g^{-1}} = r\epsilon_{g^{-1}}$$

and

$$\alpha_g(\alpha_g^{-1}(r\epsilon_g)) = s_g t_{g^{-1}} r s_g t_{g^{-1}} = \epsilon_g r \epsilon_g = r\epsilon_g.$$

The function α_g is clearly additive. Also $\alpha_g(\epsilon_{g^{-1}}) = s_g \epsilon_{g^{-1}} t_{g^{-1}} = s_g t_{g^{-1}} = \epsilon_g$. Now we show that α_g is multiplicative. Take $r, r' \in R$. Then

$$\alpha_g(rr'\epsilon_g) = s_g r r' t_{g^{-1}} = s_g r \epsilon_{g^{-1}} r' t_{g-1} = s_g r t_{g^{-1}} s_g r' t_{g^{-1}} = \alpha_g(r\epsilon_{g^{-1}})\alpha_g(r'\epsilon_{g^{-1}}).$$

Next put $w_{g,h} = s_g s_h t_{(gh)^{-1}}$. Since $w_{g,h} \in R$, $\epsilon_g s_g = s_g$ and $t_{(gh)^{-1}}\epsilon_{gh} = t_{(gh)^{-1}}$, it follows that $w_{g,h} \in D_g D_{gh}$. Now we show that $w_{g,h}$ is a unit in $D_g D_{gh}$. To this end, first notice that $\alpha_g(\epsilon_{g^{-1}}\epsilon_h) = \epsilon_g \epsilon_{gh}$. In fact, from (P2) (see below), we get that there is $r \in D_{g^{-1}} D_h$ such that $\alpha_g(r) = \epsilon_g \epsilon_{gh}$. Since $\epsilon_g \epsilon_{gh}$ is the identity of $D_g D_{gh}$, we get that $\alpha_g(\epsilon_{g^{-1}}\epsilon_h) =$

$\alpha_g(\epsilon_{g^{-1}}\epsilon_h)\epsilon_g\epsilon_{gh} = \alpha_g(\epsilon_{g^{-1}}\epsilon_h)\alpha_g(r) = \alpha_g(\epsilon_{g^{-1}}\epsilon_h r) = \alpha_g(r) = \epsilon_g\epsilon_{gh}$. Put $v_{g,h} = s_{gh}t_{h^{-1}}t_{g^{-1}}\epsilon_g\epsilon_{gh}$. Then $v_{g,h} \in D_gD_{gh}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} w_{g,h}v_{g,h} &= s_gs_ht_{(gh)^{-1}}s_{gh}t_{h^{-1}}t_{g^{-1}} = s_gs_h\epsilon_{(gh)^{-1}}t_{h^{-1}}t_{g^{-1}} = s_gs_ht_{h^{-1}}t_{g^{-1}} \\ &= s_g\epsilon_ht_{g^{-1}} = s_g\epsilon_h\epsilon_{g^{-1}}t_{g^{-1}} = \alpha_g(\epsilon_h\epsilon_{g^{-1}}) = \epsilon_g\epsilon_{gh} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} v_{g,h}w_{g,h} &= s_{gh}t_{h^{-1}}t_{g^{-1}}s_gs_ht_{(gh)^{-1}} = s_{gh}t_{h^{-1}}\epsilon_{g^{-1}}s_ht_{(gh)^{-1}} = s_{gh}t_{h^{-1}}s_ht_{(gh)^{-1}} \\ &= s_{gh}\epsilon_{h^{-1}}t_{(gh)^{-1}} = s_{gh}\epsilon_{h^{-1}}\epsilon_{(gh)^{-1}}t_{(gh)^{-1}} = \alpha_{gh}(\epsilon_{(gh)^{-1}}\epsilon_{h^{-1}}) = \epsilon_{gh}\epsilon_g\epsilon_{gh} \\ &= \epsilon_{gh}\epsilon_g. \end{aligned}$$

Now we check conditions (P1)-(P6) from the introduction.

(P1): Since $\epsilon_e = 1$, we get that $D_e = R$. Since $\gamma_e = \mathrm{id}_R$, we get that $\alpha_e = \mathrm{id}_R$.

(P2): First notice that $\alpha_g(D_{g^{-1}}D_h) = s_gD_{g^{-1}}D_ht_{g^{-1}} = s_gS_{g^{-1}}S_gS_hS_{h^{-1}}t_{g^{-1}}$. Since $s_g \in S_g$ and thus $s_gS_{g^{-1}} \in R$, we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_g(D_{g^{-1}}D_h) &= \epsilon_gs_gS_{g^{-1}}\epsilon_{gh}S_gS_hS_{h^{-1}}t_{g^{-1}} = \epsilon_g\epsilon_{gh}(s_gS_{g^{-1}}S_gS_hS_{h^{-1}}t_{g^{-1}}) \\ &\subseteq D_gD_{gh}R = D_gD_{gh}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we show the reversed inclusion. Take $r \in R$. Put $r' = t_{g^{-1}}r\epsilon_g\epsilon_{gh}s_g \in R$. Then $\epsilon_{g^{-1}}r' = r'$. Also, since $\epsilon_{gh}s_g \in S_{gh}S_{(gh)^{-1}}s_g \subseteq S_{gh}S_{h^{-1}}$, it follows that $r'\epsilon_h = r'$. Thus, $r' \in D_{g^{-1}}D_h$. Now,

$$\alpha_g(r') = s_gt_{g^{-1}}r\epsilon_g\epsilon_{gh}s_gt_{g^{-1}} = \epsilon_gr\epsilon_g\epsilon_{gh}\epsilon_g = r\epsilon_g\epsilon_{gh}.$$

(P3): Take $r \in D_{h^{-1}}D_{(gh)^{-1}}$. Then

$$\alpha_g(\alpha_h(r))w_{g,h} = s_gs_hrt_{h^{-1}}t_{g^{-1}}s_gs_ht_{(gh)^{-1}} = s_gs_hrt_{h^{-1}}\epsilon_{g^{-1}}s_ht_{(gh)^{-1}},$$

and the last expression equals

$$\begin{aligned} s_gs_hrt_{h^{-1}}s_ht_{(gh)^{-1}} &= s_g(s_hr)\epsilon_{h^{-1}}t_{(gh)^{-1}} = s_gs_hrt_{(gh)^{-1}} = s_gs_hr\epsilon_{(gh)^{-1}}t_{(gh)^{-1}} \\ &= (s_gs_ht_{(gh)^{-1}})s_{gh}rt_{(gh)^{-1}} = w_{g,h}s_{gh}rt_{(gh)^{-1}} = w_{g,h}\alpha_{gh}(r). \end{aligned}$$

(P4): Since $s_e = 1$, we get that $w_{g,e} = s_gs_et_{g^{-1}} = s_gt_{g^{-1}} = \epsilon_g$ and $w_{e,g} = s_es_gt_{g^{-1}} = s_gt_{g^{-1}} = \epsilon_g$.

(P6): Notice first that $S_g = D_g\delta_g$. In fact, since $s_g \in S_g$ and $D_g \subseteq R$ it follows that $S_g \supseteq D_gs_g$. On the other hand, take $s'_g \in S_g$. Then $s'_g = s'_g\epsilon_{g^{-1}} = s'_gt_{g^{-1}}s_g = s'_gt_{g^{-1}}\epsilon_gs_g \in D_gs_g$. Thus $S_g \subseteq D_gs_g$. So we get that $S = \oplus_{g\in G}D_gs_g$. Also, if $s = \sum_{g\in G}r_gs_g$, for $r_g \in D_g$, then the r_g's are unique. Indeed, suppose that $r_gs_g = r'_gs_g$ for some $r_g, r'_g \in D_g$. Then $r_g = r_g\epsilon_{g^{-1}} = r_gs_gt_{g^{-1}} = r'_gs_gt_{g^{-1}} = r'_g\epsilon_g = r'_g$. Take $r \in D_g$ and $r' \in D_h$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (rs_g)(r's_h) &= rs_g\epsilon_{g^{-1}}r'\epsilon_{g^{-1}}s_h = rs_g\epsilon_{g^{-1}}r't_{g^{-1}}s_gs_h = r\alpha_g(\epsilon_{g^{-1}}r')s_gs_h \\ &= r\alpha_g(\epsilon_{g^{-1}}r')s_gs_h\epsilon_{(gh)^{-1}} = r\alpha_g(\epsilon_{g^{-1}}r')s_gs_ht_{(gh)^{-1}}s_{gh} \\ &= r\alpha_g(\epsilon_{g^{-1}}r')w_{g,h}s_{gh}. \end{aligned}$$

(P5): Take $r \in D_{g^{-1}} D_h D_{hl}$. Then

$$(s_g r s_h) s_l = (\alpha_g(r) s_g s_h) s_l = (\alpha_g(r) w_{g,h} s_{gh}) s_l = \alpha_g(r) w_{g,h} w_{gh,l} s_{ghl}$$

and

$$s_g(r s_h s_l) = s_g(r w_{h,l} s_{hl}) = \alpha_g(r w_{h,l}) w_{g,hl} s_{ghl}.$$

The claim now follows from the proof of (P6) and associativity.

Now we show the "if" statement. Suppose that $S = \oplus_{g\in G} D_g\delta_g$ is a unital partial crossed product. Take $g \in G$. Since $S_g S_{g^{-1}} = D_g\delta_e$, we can put $\epsilon_g = 1_g\delta_e$. What remains to show is associativity of S. This has already been shown in a more general context (see [8, Theorem 2.4]). Here we provide a short direct proof for unital twisted partial actions. To this end, take $g, h, l \in G$, $a \in D_g$, $b \in D_h$ and $c \in D_l$. Then

$$(a\delta_g b\delta_h)c\delta_l = (a\alpha_g(1_{g^{-1}}b)w_{g,h}\delta_{gh})c\delta_l = a\alpha_g(1_{g^{-1}}b)w_{g,h}\alpha_{gh}(1_{(gh)^{-1}}c)w_{gh,l}\delta_{ghl}.$$

By (P2), the last expression equals

$$a\alpha_g(1_{g^{-1}}b)w_{g,h}\alpha_{gh}(1_{h^{-1}}1_{(gh)^{-1}}c)w_{gh,l}\delta_{ghl},$$

which, in turn, by (P3), equals

$$a\alpha_g(1_{g^{-1}}b)\alpha_g(\alpha_h(1_{h^{-1}}1_{(gh)^{-1}}c))w_{g,h}w_{gh,l}\delta_{ghl} =$$
$$a\alpha_g(1_{g^{-1}}b\alpha_h(1_{h^{-1}}1_{(gh)^{-1}}c))w_{g,h}w_{gh,l}\delta_{ghl} = a\alpha_g(1_{g^{-1}}b\alpha_h(1_{h^{-1}}c))w_{g,h}w_{gh,l}\delta_{ghl}.$$

By (P5), this equals

$$a\alpha_g(1_{g^{-1}}b\alpha_h(1_{h^{-1}})w_{h,l})w_{g,hl}\delta_{ghl} = a\delta_g(b\alpha_h(1_{h^{-1}}c)w_{h,l}\delta_{hl}) = a\delta_g(b\delta_h c\delta_l).$$

□

Definition 28. Suppose that $S = R\star_\alpha^w G$ is a unital partial crossed product. Let $Z(R)_{\alpha,\mathrm{fin}}$ denote the set of $r \in Z(R)$ with the property that for all but finitely many $g \in G$, the relation $r1_g = 0$ holds. Define the trace map $t_\alpha : Z(R)_{\alpha,\mathrm{fin}} \to Z(R)$ by $t_\alpha(r) = \sum_{g\in G} \alpha_g(r1_{g^{-1}})$, for $r \in Z(R)_{\alpha,\mathrm{fin}}$.

Theorem 29. *If S is a unital partial crossed product of a group G over R, then S/R is separable if and only if $1 \in \mathrm{tr}_\alpha(Z(R)_{\mathrm{fin}})$.*

Proof. This follows from Theorem 3 and Theorem 27. □

Lemma 30. *Suppose that S is a unital partial crossed product of a group G over R and take $g \in G$. If D_g is projective as a left (right) R-module, then $S_g = D_g\delta_g$ is projective as a left (right) R-module.*

Proof. The "left" part is trivial since the left action of R on S_g is defined by the left action of R on D_g. Now we show the "right" part. Suppose that D_g is projective as a right R-module. Let $\{d_i, f_i\}_{i\in I}$ be a projective basis for D_g as a right R-module. For each $i \in I$, define $\overline{f}_i : D_g \to R$ by the relations $\overline{f}_i(d) = \alpha_g^{-1}(1_g f_i(d))$, for $d \in D_g$. Then $\{d_i\delta_g, \overline{f}_i\}_{i\in I}$ is a projective basis for $S_g = D_g\delta_g$ as a right R-module. In fact, if $d \in D_g$, then

$$\sum_{i\in I}(d_i\delta_g)(\overline{f}_i(d)\delta_e) = \sum_{i\in I} d_i\alpha_g(\overline{f}_i(d))w_{g,e}\delta_g = \sum_{i\in I} d_i 1_g f_i(d)\delta_g = d\delta_g.$$

□

Theorem 31. *Suppose that S is a unital partial crossed product of a group G over R and that R is semisimple (left/right hereditary). If $1 \in \mathrm{tr}_\gamma(Z(R)_{\mathrm{fin}})$, then S is semisimple (left/right hereditary). In particular, if $\epsilon_g = 0$ for all but finitely many $g \in G$ and $\mathrm{tr}_\gamma(1)$ is invertible in R, then S is semisimple (left/right hereditary).*

Proof. The "semisimple" part follows from Theorem 18. The "hereditary" part follows from Theorem 18, Lemma 30 and the fact that all the ideals D_g, for $g \in G$, of the hereditary ring R, are left/right projective. □

6. Examples: A Dade-Like Construction

In this section, we give a class of examples of separable epsilon-strongly graded rings, neither of which are strongly graded, nor partial crossed products, in any natural way. Our inspiration comes from the first known example (due to E. Dade, according to [6, Example 2.9]) of a strongly graded ring which is not a crossed product. Namely, suppose that A is a commutative unital ring with a non-zero multiplicative identity 1_A. Put

$$S = M_3(A), \quad R = \begin{pmatrix} A & A & 0 \\ A & A & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & A \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & A \\ 0 & 0 & A \\ A & A & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then S is strongly $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded with $S_0 = R$ and $S_1 = T$, but S is not a crossed product of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ over R since T does not contain any invertible element from S. Our idea is to postulate another unital commutative ring B with a non-zero multiplicative identity 1_B such B is an ideal of A with $B \subsetneq A$. Now we modify Dade's example by putting

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} A & A & B \\ A & A & B \\ B & B & A \end{pmatrix}, \quad R = \begin{pmatrix} A & A & 0 \\ A & A & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & A \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & B \\ 0 & 0 & B \\ B & B & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proposition 32. *The ring S is epsilon strongly $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded with $S_0 = R$ and $S_1 = T$. With this grading, S is neither strongly graded, nor a partial crossed product. Moreover, the ring extension S/R is separable.*

Proof. If we put

$$\epsilon_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1_A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_A & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_A \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1_B & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_B & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_B \end{pmatrix},$$

then it is clear that $RR = R\epsilon_0$ and $TT = \epsilon_1 R$. Hence S is epsilon-strongly $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded. The equality $TT = \epsilon_1 R$ also shows that S is not strongly graded, since $1_A \notin B$. Seeking a contradiction, suppose that this grading presents S as a partial crossed product of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ over R. Then there is $\delta_1 \in T$ and a

non-zero unital ideal D of R such that $T = D\delta_1$. Let the identity element of D be denoted by 1_D. From (P6) it follows that

$$(w_{1,1}^{-1}\delta_1)(1_D\delta_1) = 1_D\delta_0. \tag{1}$$

Take $b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4 \in B$ such that

$$\delta_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & b_3 \\ 0 & 0 & b_4 \\ b_1 & b_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then relation (1) can be written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & w_{1,1}^{-1}b_3 \\ 0 & 0 & w_{1,1}^{-1}b_4 \\ w_{1,1}^{-1}b_1 & w_{1,1}^{-1}b_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1_Db_3 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_Db_4 \\ 1_Db_1 & 1_Db_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1_D & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_D \end{pmatrix}$$

which is impossible since the determinant of the left side is zero while the determinant of the right side is non-zero. Now we show that S/R is separable. First of all, it is easy to show that

$$Z(R) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a' \end{pmatrix} \;\middle|\; a, a' \in A \right\}.$$

We know that $\gamma_0 : Z(R) \to Z(R)$ is the identity map on $Z(R)$. Now we determine $\gamma_1 : Z(R) \to Z(R)$. To this end, let e_{ij} denote the 3×3 matrix over A with 1_A in the ijth position, and zeros elsewhere. Since

$$1_Be_{13}1_Be_{31} + 1_Be_{23}1_Be_{32} + 1_Be_{31}1_Be_{13} = \epsilon_1$$

the map $\gamma_1 : Z(R) \to Z(R)$ is defined by

$$Z(R) \ni r \mapsto 1_Be_{13}r1_Be_{31} + 1_Be_{23}r1_Be_{32} + 1_Be_{31}r1_Be_{13}.$$

Thus, the trace map $\mathrm{tr}_\gamma : Z(R) \to Z(R)$ is defined by

$$Z(R) \ni r \mapsto r + 1_Be_{13}r1_Be_{31} + 1_Be_{23}r1_Be_{32} + 1_Be_{31}r1_Be_{13}.$$

By Theorem 3, we can deduce that S/R is separable if we can find

$$r = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a' \end{pmatrix} \in Z(R)$$

such that

$$\mathrm{tr}_\gamma(r) = \begin{pmatrix} 1_A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_A & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_A \end{pmatrix}.$$

By a straightforward calculation, the last relation is equivalent to the set of equations $a + 1_Ba' = 1_A$ and $a' + 1_Ba = 1_A$. It is easy to see that this set of equations is satisfied if we e.g. put $a = 1_A$ and $a' = 1_A - 1_B$. Therefore, S/R is separable. □

It is easy to give concrete examples of rings A and B which fit into the above construction. In fact, from now on in this section, suppose that $\mathbb{F}$ is a field, $A = \mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{F}$ and $B = \mathbb{F} \times \{0\}$. In that case, the sufficient condition for separability in Corollary 13 is not necessary.

Proposition 33. *With the above notation,* $\mathrm{tr}_\gamma(1_R)$ *is invertible in* R *if and only if* $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F}) \neq 2$.

Proof. Since

$$1_R = \begin{pmatrix} 1_A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_A & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_A \end{pmatrix},$$

we get, from the proof of Proposition 32, that

$$\mathrm{tr}_\gamma(1_R) = \begin{pmatrix} 1_A + 1_B & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_A + 1_B & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_A + 1_B \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $1_A + 1_B = (1,1) + (1,0) = (2,1)$, we get that $\mathrm{tr}_\gamma(1_R)$ is invertible in R if and only if $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F}) \neq 2$. □

7. Examples: Morita rings

Let $(A, B, {}_A M_B, {}_B N_A, \varphi, \phi)$ be a strict Morita context. It consists of unital rings A and B, an $A-B$-bimodule M, an $B-A$-bimodule N, an $A-A$-bimodule epimorphism $\varphi : M \otimes_B N \to A$ and an $B-B$-bimodule epimorphism $\phi : N \otimes_A M \to B$.

The associated *Morita ring* is the set

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} A & M \\ N & B \end{pmatrix}$$

equipped with the natural addition and with a multiplication defined by

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & m_1 \\ n_1 & b_1 \end{pmatrix} * \begin{pmatrix} a_2 & m_2 \\ n_2 & b_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_1a_2 + \varphi(m_1 \otimes n_2) & a_1m_2 + m_1b_2 \\ n_1a_2 + b_1n_2 & \phi(n_1 \otimes m_2) + b_1b_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

for $a_1, a_2 \in A$, $b_1, b_2 \in B$, $m_1, m_2 \in M$ and $n_1, n_2 \in N$. Let G be an infinite cyclic group, generated by g. We can define a G-grading on S by putting

$$R = S_e = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}, \quad S_g = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad S_{g^{-1}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ N & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and $S_h = \{\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)\}$ for every $h \in G \setminus \{e, g, g^{-1}\}$. It is easy to see that

$$S_g S_{g^{-1}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Im}(\varphi) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$S_{g^{-1}} S_g = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathrm{Im}(\phi) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}$$

and thus S is obviously not strongly graded. However, S is epsilon-strongly graded. Indeed, if we put

$$\epsilon_g = \begin{pmatrix} 1_A & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \epsilon_{g^{-1}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_B \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \epsilon_e = \epsilon_g + \epsilon_{g^{-1}}$$

then it is easy to verify that this yields an epsilon-strong G-grading on S. From the fact that $\mathrm{Supp}(S) = \{g \in G \mid S_g \neq \{0\}\}$ is finite, we immediately see that

$$Z(R)_{\mathrm{fin}} = Z(R) = \begin{pmatrix} Z(A) & 0 \\ 0 & Z(B) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Remark 34. With this grading one can find examples in which the Morita ring S is not a partial crossed product of G over $R = S_e$. Indeed, let P be a progenerator in the category $\mathrm{mod} - R$, of right R-modules. It follows by [11, Theorem 3.20] that $(\mathrm{End}P_R, R, P, P^* = \hom(P_R, R), \varphi, \phi)$, where $\varphi\colon P^* \otimes_{\mathrm{End}P_R} P \ni f \otimes p \to f(p) \in R$ and $\varphi\colon P \otimes_R P^* \ni p \otimes f \to f_p \in \mathrm{End}P_R$, and $f_p(r) = pf(r)$, for all $r \in R$, is a strict Morita context. Consider the associated Morita ring S, and put $\mathcal{D}_g = S_g S_{g^{-1}}$. Since, in general, as left $\mathrm{End}P_R$-modules, $\mathrm{End}P_R$ is not isomorphic to P, it follows by [8, Theorem 6.5] that S is not a partial crossed product of G over S_e.

A concrete example is obtained by taking a commutative unital ring R and $P = R^n$, for some $n > 1$.

Proposition 35. *Let $(A, B, {}_A M_B, {}_B N_A, \varphi, \phi)$ be a strict Morita context, and let S be the associated Morita ring. Then the extension S/R is separable.*

Proof. We know that $\gamma_0 : Z(R) \to Z(R)$ is the identity map on $Z(R)$. Now we determine γ_g and $\gamma_{g^{-1}}$. Let $\sum_i m_i \otimes n_i \in M \otimes_B N$ be such that $\sum_i \varphi(m_i \otimes n_i) = 1_A$ and $\sum_j n_j \otimes m_j \in N \otimes_A M$ with $\sum_j \phi(n_j \otimes m_j) = 1_B$. Then for $ae_{11} + be_{22} \in Z(R)$ one has that

$$\gamma_g(ae_{11} + be_{22}) = \sum_i \varphi(m_i b \otimes n_i) e_{11}$$

and

$$\gamma_{g^{-1}}(ae_{11} + be_{22}) = \sum_j \phi(n_j a \otimes m_j) e_{22}.$$

Then the trace map $\mathrm{tr}_\gamma : Z(R) \to Z(R)$ is given by

$$ae_{11} + be_{22} \mapsto ae_{11} + be_{22} + \sum_i \varphi(m_i b \otimes n_i) e_{11} + \sum_j \phi(n_j a \otimes m_j) e_{22}.$$

From this it follows that $\mathrm{tr}(1_A e_{11}) = 1_A e_{11} + 1_B e_{22}$, and hence S/R is separable due to Theorem 3. □

Example 36. Let $T = \oplus_{g \in G} T_g$ be a ring which is strongly graded by a group G. Fix $g \in G$ and consider the strict Morita context $(T_e, T_e, T_g, T_{g^{-1}}, \varphi, \phi)$ where $\varphi : T_g \otimes_{T_e} T_{g^{-1}} \to T_e$ and $\phi : T_{g^{-1}} \otimes_{T_e} T_g \to T_e$ are the canonical

T_e-bimodule isomorphisms (see [21, Corollary 3.1.2] and [5]). The corresponding Morita ring $S = \begin{pmatrix} T_e & T_g \\ T_{g^{-1}} & T_e \end{pmatrix}$ is epsilon-strongly graded by an infinite cyclic group G, generated by g, as described above. By Proposition 35, S is separable over $R = \begin{pmatrix} T_e & 0 \\ 0 & T_e \end{pmatrix}$.

Remark 37. If S is a ring which is strongly graded by G, then $G = \mathrm{Supp}(S) = \{g \in G \mid S_g \neq \{0\}\}$ necessarily holds. However, if S is only epsilon-strongly graded by G, then $\mathrm{Supp}(S)$ need not even be a subgroup of G. Indeed, consider Example 36 and notice that g belongs to $\mathrm{Supp}(S)$ but that $S_{g^2} = \{\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)\}$. Hence, in this case $\mathrm{Supp}(S)$ is not closed under group multiplication.

References

[1] D. Bagio, J. Lazzarin and A. Paques, Crossed Products by Twisted Partial Acctions: Separability, Semisimplicity and Frobenius Properties, *Comm. Algebra* **38**(2), 496–508 (2010).

[2] L. Le Bruyn, M. Van den Bergh and F. Van Oystaeyen, *Graded Orders*, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA (1988).

[3] S. Caenepeel and F. Van Oystaeyen, *Brauer Groups and the Cohomology of Graded Rings*, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 121, Marcel Dekker, New York (1988).

[4] F. Castaño Iglesias, J. Gómez Torrecillas and C. Năstăsescu, Separable functors in graded rings, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **127**, 219–230 (1998).

[5] E. C. Dade, Group-Graded Rings and Modules, *Math. Z.* **174**(3), 241–262 (1980).

[6] S. Dăscălescu, B. Ion, C. Năstăsescu and J. Ríos Montes, Group Gradings on Full Matrix Rings, *J. Algebra* **220**(2), 709–728 (1999).

[7] F. DeMeyer and E. Ingraham, *Separable Algebras Over Commutative Rings*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 181, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York (1971).

[8] M. Dokuchaev, R. Exel and J. J. Simón, Crossed Products by Twisted Partial Actions and Graded Algebras, *J. Algebra* **320**(8), 3278–3310 (2008).

[9] J. Haefner and G. Janusz, Hereditary crossed products, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **352**(7), 3381–3410 (2000)

[10] J. Haefner and C. J. Pappacena, Strongly graded hereditary orders, *Comm. Algebra* **29**(12), 5535–5542 (2001).

[11] N. Jacobson, *Basic Algebra II*, W. H. Freeman and Company, New York (1989).

[12] L. Kadison, *New Examples of Frobenius Extensions*, University Lecture Series, Vol. 14, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (1999).

[13] T. Y. Lam, *A First Course in Noncommutative Rings*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 131, Springer-Verlag, New York (1991).

[14] P. Lundström, Crossed Product Algebras Defined by Separable Extensions, *J. Algebra* **283**(2), 723–737 (2005).

[15] P. Lundström, Separable Groupoid Rings, *Comm. Algebra* **34**(8), 3029–3041 (2006).

[16] J. Öinert, Simple group graded rings and maximal commutativity. Operator structures and dynamical systems, 159-175, *Contemp. Math.* **503**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2009.

[17] J. Öinert and P. Lundström, The ideal intersection property for groupoid graded rings, *Comm. Algebra* **40**(5), 1860–1871 (2012).

[18] Y. Miyashita, On Galois Extensions and Crossed Products, *J. Fac. Sci. Hokkaido Univ. Ser. I* **21**, 97–121 (1970).

[19] C. Năstăsescu and F. Van Oystaeyen, *Graded Ring Theory*, North-Holland Mathematical Library, Vol. 28, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York (1982).
[20] C. Năstăsescu, M. Van den Bergh and F. Van Oystaeyen, Separable Functors Applied to Graded Rings, *J. Algebra* **123**(2), 397–413 (1989).
[21] C. Năstăsescu and F. Van Oystaeyen, *Methods of graded rings*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 1836. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2004).
[22] M. D. Rafael, Separable functors revisited, *Comm. Algebra* **18**(5), 1445–1459 (1990).
[23] I. Reiner, *Maximal Orders*, London Math. Soc. Monographs, No. 5, Academic Press, London-New York (1975).
[24] T. Theohari-Apostolidi and H. Vavatsoulas, On the separability of the restriction functor, *Algebra Discrete Math.* **3**, 95–101 (2003).